



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/820,704	04/09/2004	Katsunori Enomoto	119407	8737
25944 7590 12/22/2008 OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 320850 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850				
EXAMINER				
PACHOL, NICHOLAS C				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2625				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/22/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Interview Summary

**Application No.**

10/820,704

**Applicant(s)**

ENOMOTO, KATSUNORI

**Examiner**

Nicholas C. Pachol

**Art Unit**

2625

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Nicholas C. Pachol.(3) Lenwood Faulcon (Reg 61310).(2) King Poon.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 18 December 2008.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conferencec) ☒ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 12.

Identification of prior art discussed: Tada (US 6,144,777) in view of Takeuchi (US 5,978,614) further in view of Anderson (US 6,646,768).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The examiner further clarified the sensor of Anderson and how it applied to the claim. Further clarified how the examiner is viewing the control section in respect to the detection result. The applicant's representative discussed how claims 1 and 12 distinguish over the prior art.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Nicholas C Pachol/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2625

/King Y. Poon/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625